

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 05 AUG 2005

WIPO

PCT

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:
GREGORY W. O'CONNOR
SAMSONITE CORPORATION
11200 EAST FORTY-FIFTH AVENUE
DENVER, CO 80239

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **03 AUG 2005**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

P70791

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/US05/04197

International filing date (day/month/year)

09 February 2005 (09.02.2005)

Priority date (day/month/year)

17 February 2004 (17.02.2004)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC(7): A45C 13/00; A45C 3/00 and US Cl.: 190/903, 115, 111

Applicant

SAMSONITE CORPORATION

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230

Authorized officer

Tri M. Mai

Telephone No. (571)242-4050

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US05/04197

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/US05/04197

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>2, 4, 6, 8</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-10</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-10</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Geary (5944155). Geary teaches a case having pocket comprises an all-sides accessible pocket (the pocket is defined by the panel 82 in Fig. 3 and the wall having portion 88). Note the tapered portion at the pocket 42.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Wu (6467594). Wu teaches a case having pocket comprises an all-sides accessible pocket (the pocket is defined by bag 120 and the panel 110 Fig. 1). Note the tapered portion corner of the luggage.

Claims 1, and 5, lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Tucker (4081061). Tucker teaches a case having pocket comprises an all-sides accessible pocket (the pocket is defined by bag 122 and the panel 10 Fig. 12).

Claims 4 and 8 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over either Wu or Geary in view of Waddell et al. (5630521). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the castor wheels in either Wu or Geary as taught by Waddell to navigate the container easily.

Claims 9 and 10 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over either Wu or Geary in view of Scicluna (5984154). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the shoulder straps in either Wu or Geary as taught by Scicluna to provide another means for transporting the luggage.

Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Lin (6431334). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a tracking device, i.e., the lock 19, in Wu as taught by Lin to secure the pocket.

Claims 1, 5, 9, and 10 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Worley et al. (D431903), or in the alternative, lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over either. Worley in view of Barry (5004134). Worley teaches a case having pocket comprises an all-sides accessible pocket (note the zipper extending into the zipper area). In the alternative, Barry teaches that it is known in the art to extend the zipper substantially as shown in Fig. 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a zipper extending substantially around the pocket to provide added flexibility.

Claims 1-10 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.